

Security Classification	
NPCC Policy: Documents <u>cannot</u> be accepted or ratified without a security classification (Protective Marking may assist in assessing whether exemptions to FOIA <u>may</u> apply):	
OFFICIAL-SENSITIVE	
Freedom of information (FOI)	
This document (including attachments and appendices) may be subject to an FOI request and the NPCC FOI Officer & Decision Maker will consult with you on receipt of a request prior to any disclosure. For external Public Authorities in receipt of an FOI, please consult with npcc.foi.request@npfdu.police.uk	
Author and Contributors:	
Force/Organisation:	NPCC
Date Created:	27 September 2023
Coordination Committee:	NPCC Central Office
Portfolio:	N/A
Attachments @ para	N/A
Information Governance & Security	
<p>In compliance with the Government’s Security Policy Framework’s (SPF) mandatory requirements, please ensure any onsite printing is supervised, and storage and security of papers are in compliance with the SPF. Dissemination or further distribution of this paper is strictly on a need to know basis and in compliance with other security controls and legislative obligations. If you require any advice, please contact npcc.foi.request@npfdu.police.uk</p> <p style="text-align: center;">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/security-policy-framework/hmg-security-policy-framework#risk-management</p>	

Chief Constables' Council Minutes

27-28 September 2023

Attendees

AC Gavin Stephens	NPCC Chair
CC Sara Crew	Avon and Somerset
DCC Nikki Watson	Avon and Somerset
CC Trevor Rodenhurst	Bedfordshire
DCC Dan Vajzovic	Bedfordshire
CC Nick Dean	Cambridgeshire
CC Mark Roberts	Cheshire
ACC Bill Dutton	Cheshire
Cmsr Angela McClaren	City of London

CC Mark Webster
CC Rob Carden
CC Rachel Swann
CC Will Kerr
Det Supt Mark Beacon
CC Amanda Pearson
DCC Ciaron Irvine
CC Dr Richard Lewis
CC Ben-Julian Harrington

Cleveland
Cumbria
Derbyshire Constabulary
Devon and Cornwall
Devon and Cornwall
Dorset
Durham
Dyfed-Powys
Essex

CC Rod Hansen	Gloucestershire
ACO Ian Cosh	Greater Manchester
CC Pam Kelly	Gwent
CC Scott Chilton	Hampshire
CC Charlie Hall	Hertfordshire
DCC Paul Anderson	Humberside
CC Tim Smith	Kent
CC Chris Rowley	Lancashire
CC Rob Nixon	Leicestershire
CC Chris Haward	Lincolnshire
CC Serena Kennedy	Merseyside
AC Matt Jukes	Metropolitan Police Service
AC Louisa Rolfe	Metropolitan Police Service
AC Barbara Gray	Metropolitan Police Service
CC Amanda Blakeman	North Wales
CC Paul Sanford	Norfolk Constabulary
CC Nick Adderley	Northamptonshire
CC Kate Meynell	Nottinghamshire
CC Vanessa Jardine	Northumbria
CC Lisa Winward	North Yorkshire
Sir Iain Livingstone	Police Scotland
DCC Jane Connors	Police Scotland
DCC (Designate) Fiona Taylor	Police Scotland
ACC Wendy Middleton	Police Scotland
T/DCC Alan Speirs	Police Scotland
ACC Bex Smith	Police Scotland
ACC Andy Freeburn	Police Scotland
ACC Steve Johnson	Police Scotland
Director Katy Miller	Police Scotland
Andrew Hendry	Police Scotland
Patrick Brown	Police Scotland
Director Tom McMahon	Police Scotland
DCC Mark Hamilton	Police Service for Northern Ireland
ACC Alan Todd	Police Service for Northern Ireland
CC James Vaughan	South Wales
CC Lauren Poultney	South Yorkshire
CC Chris Noble	Staffordshire
CC Rachel Kearton	Suffolk
CC Tim De Meyer	Surrey
CC Jo Shiner	Sussex
CC Jason Hogg	Thames Valley
DCC Ben Snuggs	Thames Valley
CC Debra Tedds	Warwickshire
CC Pippa Mills	West Mercia
CC Craig Guildford	West Midlands
CC John Robins	West Yorkshire
CC Catherine Roper	Wiltshire
CC Lucy D'Orsi	British Transport Police

CC Simon Chesterman	Civil Nuclear Constabulary
CEO Andy Marsh	College of Policing
DG Graeme Biggar	National Crime Agency
DDG Rob Jones	National Crime Agency
CC Melanie Dales	Ministry of Defence Police
Provost Marshall Sarah Pringle-Smith	Royal Military Police

Gp Capt Russ Foster-Jones
Col Kristian Rotchell
CO Ruari Hardy
CO Robin Smith
CO Russell Foster
CC Chris Eyre
Cmsr Ian McGrail

Royal Airforce Police
Royal Navy Police
Guernsey Police
States of Jersey Police
Isle of Man Police
Sovereign bases of Royal Cyprus Police
Royal Gibraltar Police

In attendance

HMI Wendy Williams
Abimbola Johnson
DAC Laurence Taylor
Clifford Stott

ACC Alex Goss
Nick Bayley
Tom Harding
Sam De Reya
Dee Perkins
HMI Andy Cooke
Suzette Allcorn
Professor Paul Taylor
AC Stephen Jupp
Alan Pughsley
Lianne Deeming
DCC Maggie Blyth
Jo Noakes
Roisha Hughes
Alan Pughsley
ACC Mark Williams
Gemma Stannard

Garda Police
HMICFRS
Independent Scrutiny Oversight Board
Metropolitan Police Service
Keele University
West Midlands Police
North Wales Police
College of Policing
College of Policing
Hampshire Constabulary
Operation Soteria
HMICFRS
HMICFRS
NPCC Chief Scientific Officer Policing
Serious and Organised Crime Lead
NPCC Review of Productivity in Policing Team
CEO BlueLight Commercial
NPCC Violence Against Women and Girls Lead
College of Policing
NPCC Productivity Review Team
Head of NPCC Productivity Review
NPoCC
NPCC Strategic Hub Lead
NPCC Head of Organisational Development and Change
NPCC Strategy, Planning and Performance Lead
NPCC Business Support Manager
NPCC Staff Officer to NPCC Chair
NPCC Freedom of Information Act Officer
NPCC Freedom of Information Act Officer
NPCC Strategy, Planning and Performance Team
NPCC Strategy, Planning and Performance Team
NPCC Head of Communications
NPCC Business Support Assistant
NPCC Business Support Assistant

NPCC Business Support Officer
NPCC Business Support Officer
NPCC Executive Assistant to NPCC Chair

SESSION 1:

MINUTES AND ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes for the previous meetings held were agreed:

Decision: July 2023 – Agreed

The minutes for the extraordinary CCC will be finalised and submitted to the December meeting,

The action log is all in hand and will be reported against in the next meeting.

Parish Notices

The chair welcomed visitors to CCC. The following new appointments were mentioned at the meeting:

- CC Rachel Bacon who has been appointed as the new Chief Constable (CC) for Durham Constabulary with Jo Farrell having been appointed as the new Chief Constable for Police Scotland.
- Pippa Mills and Matt Twist who have been appointed as Assistant Commissioners in the Metropolitan Police Service.
- Maggie Blyth who is now the Deputy Chief Executive to the College of Policing. An advert is now out for an ACC replacement for her role.
- Matt Hopley who is the new Police Chaplain.
- A warm welcome was expressed to Mark Williams who is the new Head of NPoCC.
- CC Lisa Winward has announced her retirement from the Police Service.
- (redacted) has left PSNI. A thank you was expressed to those who have supported the PSNI team. The appointment process for the new Chief Constable of PSNI is now open.

NPCC Roles:

- Rob Carden has been appointed as the new Chair for the DDAT Committee. Rob Carden is looking for a new lead for dangerous dogs which will be advertised on ChiefsNet – **(Action)**
- The SOC Chief role is due to close imminently.
- A Chief Constable is required for the ESN role. Chief Constables are encouraged to apply for this role once re-advertised on ChiefsNet – **(Action)**.
- A replacement will be sought for a lead for the Local Policing Committee and a new Chief Lead for the Science and Innovation NPCC Coordination Committee. Both roles will be advertised to all chiefs on ChiefsNet – **(Action)**
- Thanks was expressed to Amanda Pearson for her work in the stop and search role and an advert is out now for someone to take on this role.
- The Chair congratulated Cleveland and Gloucestershire for coming out of engage and commented on the great progress being made with the excellent presentations given by the teams in the oversight group.

Chair's Update

Update on Firearms and the Review.

It was reported that the situation has improved with some officers in the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) returning to their duties.

The request is projected through until Wednesday of next week. NPoCC are working hard to fulfil these requirements. There are regions who are supplying assets but there are still some gaps, so forces are encouraged to support to meet the requirements. Some detailed discussions have been had with firearms officers to try and reassure them over what the deployments will look like and how they will be received in London. London is engaging to help support officers when they come in. Thanks were expressed to colleagues and forces who have provided support so far and a plea was made for forces who haven't yet come forward to support.

There is a challenge point coming up with the Anonymity hearing. If anonymity is lifted, this could cause a significant problem.

There is the review which the Home Secretary announced and there is engagement with the Home Office to try and find out more detail on this. There is the need to do some retrospective engagement with the Attorney General's office and the Ministry of Justice (MoJ). They are working up a framework looking at the legal process, the timelines, what the thresholds will look like and the communications. The Home office will be putting a small team together to manage the review with other government departments represented on there. There may be the option to get an NPCC member on board. This timescale for the review will be quick. There is a window of opportunity with legislation going through at the end of October so if changes can be brought into this legislation, then this will speed up the process. The Terms of Reference are being worked upon but will be drawn up based on the open letter that was sent back in response to the announcement of the review.

Six key areas to be covered are:

- Legal regulatory changes. Amendments to ensure the application of subjective criminal law tests self-defence for police misconduct. Not the objective civil test. A simplified process with better protection for the public.
- Introduction of criminal standard of proof for unlawful killing in inquests and enquiries.
- Changes to the threshold at which the IOPC can launch criminal or misconduct investigations.
- Policy and practice changes. How the CPS policy can be strengthened for legal protection for officers who use force.
- Looking at time limits for IOPC and CPS to reduce the impact lengthy investigations have on officers who are subject to those investigations.
- Improve the balance in the communications and release of information to the public to get the right balance between public confidence and the officers involved.

There may be the opportunity to put more things in. Firearms is a strong focus but there should be other things such as police pursuits, other use of force. There is a real opportunity to make changes which will impact the workforce. A small group of NPCC leads will be put together next week.

The issue of regions responding to mutual aid was discussed and it was confirmed that when regions are asked to be able to provide mutual aid then it is their public duty to do so and at least at the minimum level.

Action: Team pulling together group of NPCC leads next week to gather evidence base to submit to the Home Office review.

Chief Officers Day

Chief Officers Day will take place 12 October with strong attendance encouraged from ACCs/DCCs and to support the Wellbeing session.

Historical Data Wash Update

It was reported that the process is nearly at the end of phase 3 with 99.5% complete. A thank you was expressed to all forces who have done their returns.

There is some interest from both the Association of Police and Crime Commissioners (APCC) and Police Crime Commissioners (PCCs) to publish that they have finished the historic data wash and to start publishing results. However, a report will be received in November around the lessons learned, there is an extraordinary CCC in January to agree what is going to be published as per the FOI Publication Strategy which has been worked on by the programme board. The FOI Publication strategy has been signed off and has been through all the Trade Unions and Staff Associations. There will be some briefings with key stakeholders.

There is the need to wait before publishing individual data and wait for the publication strategy timelines in January. The stakeholders include the Home Office (HO), APCC, NPCC at the extraordinary CCC in January. The data will be released nationally and not broken down to force level.

The CIS is still being worked on which is being presented to the PSG group in November with hopefully getting money assigned to go and procure a CIS solution. There may be the need for another historical data wash as the CIS tool may not be ready and they may need to secure some additional funding for the historical data wash.

Home Office Counting Rules Update

CCC wrote to the Home Secretary via the NPCC Chair with the main issues and concerns and one was around CDI. There was a round table discussion last year with the policing minister to address what forces wanted to explore to take away the burden and bureaucracy that home office counting rules have caused to officers, staff and back-office functionality with a view to making it more victim focused. Phase 1 was pushed through rapidly but with lots of consultation and the principle of Crime Counting Rule was restored. HMIC had asked for this back in 2017 but it had not been moved on.

Phase 1 included:

- Changes to the Crime cancellation rules.
- Improved training for force crime registrars and designated decision makers.
- Denotification of section 5 of the Public Order Act.

Phase 2 Included:

- A review of all outcomes.
- Self-generated indecent images of children.
- N300 and N200 work.
- Extent of the notifiable offences list.

The New System:

- The new system will be in categories of solved, resolved and unsolved.
- Some are quite straightforward.
- Resolved issues are where the offender is dead for example, deferred prosecutions, deferred cautions.
- Every code will have clear criteria for use. Currently there are different misinterpretations/interpretations of the code. There will be consistency around the country around application.
- There will be a decision tree developed with a question set for officers to work through. The system will decide on the outcome. The data will be on there to assist in respect of a

classification and a correct outcome.

- Forces may be missing lots of positive outcomes with officers not understanding the correct code and outcome.

There has been a lot of work being going on regarding the distinction between adult and child applications that have coding, around cautioning, out of court disposals which is all going to be captured going forward.

Recommendations:

- There will be a full refresh of the codes so that they are fit for purpose.
- Outcome 14, 15 and 16 – if a victim wants to tell us about an incident but not report it, then they can record it but there will be a safeguard in place to detail the rationale.
- There will be the development of a Decision tree.
- To distinguish between an adult or a child application.
- There has been work on the abusive images of children. Putting a child on as a subject and not a suspect if there are non-aggravating factors. Looking at educating the child with an online course with a code assigned and educating the child around the dangers of what they are doing.
- N300 – creating an open/closing code for unexpected, non- suspicious deaths.
- N200 – how to re-introduce the move back to the principle of crime rule.
- Notifiable Offences list – There are 1600 currently. How to adopt a new notifiable offense and to take them off the list.

Next steps:

- To make sure can get into Home Office counting rules what forces want.
- To make sure it is fit for purpose.

Questions were raised around the use of the term “resolved” when in fact the matter has been “solved” as the offender has been identified but a different decision been made about the outcome in terms of punishment or reparation for that offender and how will this term be perceived by government/the public? The issue of training and briefing was raised which will be through the College with a complete refresh planned.

National Standards for Incident Recording (NSIR) Update:

The current NSIR was written in 2010 with no review period which has resulted in the need to re-write the whole of the guidance document.

They have been working with the Productivity Review team to streamline processes and address elements of non- police demand.

There have been some unsuccessful attempts to get the NSIR work off the ground previously.

The review was started in April of this year and the areas which were identified to focus on were:

1. To look at current demands and challenges to policing currently.
2. To achieve a consistent approach to incident recording.
3. To focus on core police responsibilities.

The work resulted in 15 recommendations including areas which are topical around Violence against Women and Girls (VAWG), Right Care Right Person (RCRP) and NCHI. The focus has been on trying to streamline and simplify incident recording and a report has been issued to explain each of the recommendations.

Over the last 6-8 months, there has been a push towards a high level of consultation. There has been a national senior stakeholder group which has met on several occasions and all forces have been written to with good engagement across the board. There has been work with the Victims Commissioner and Domestic Abuse Commissioner. There has been engagement with the HMIC.

There are 4 new objectives in terms of incident recording:

- 1) Understanding at first point of call, what the caller needs and try to “first contact resolve” where possible as opposed to creating an incident for every single call for service.
- 2) Focus on the need for the caller – the demand isn’t always for police.
- 3) To identify risk and reduce harm.
- 4) Forces have gone in different directions around incident recording. There was no consistency or governance – The College of Policing have been reviewing the processes and whether they are still fit for purpose.

There has been the introduction of the thrive assessment tool. Some forces already use this but not all forces do. Thrive is utilised as the main assessment tool at point of call. If information changes then re-thrive is used.

There is the need to get a national corporate approach to risk assessments within incidents which is important. There was feedback from forces, HMIC and support agencies to get a structure to incident recording. There is a lot of police demand which does not need incident recording. There is a time when you need to create an incident, to carry out a THRIVE assessment but it just sits on the system. There is a need to create an incident as there has been a call for service, but a resource is not deployed to the incident, and no police activity has taken place. An incident comes in, they deploy a resource and take come action.

A question is often set at point of call to enable more consistency in terms of incident recording. A training package is required and will be provided for call handlers. There is more work to be carried out with Productivity Review Team. This will then be taken to CCC.

National Wellbeing APP

Decision: The APP is well underway in terms of development and is anticipated to be complete in draft form by the end of October 2023, prior to public consultation via the College of Policing. Further key dates will be released in due course.

Regional Papers

Decision: All decisions and actions from the regional papers are listed in the circulated slides contained within the CCC pack:

NPCC Strategic Hub Risk Approach

Action: NPCC SPP team will respond to the London regional comments.

Decisions:

- Chiefs noted the review of the development of the RMF and the proposed SRA and provide comment on the update and planned activity.
- Chiefs supported all to contact to the NPCC SPP team to provide strategic risk concerns for consideration/inclusion in the SRA reporting planned for submission to CCC in December 2023.

Victims and Prisoners Bill Witness Care Units

Action: Author to liaise with the regions to address and deliver on the following commentary/observations from forces:

- **South West** – A set of firm national principles could inhibit creative working in forces. If the set of principles / national model is inflexible this could cause inefficiencies and duplication for local force arrangements.
- The Witness Care Officer role profile to standardise the role is supported, but this would need to consider variances across forces. Forces have merged witness care with case file builders within Criminal Justice, this needs to be untangled first before a standard role profile can be built.
- **London** – MPS has declined (in agreement with MOPAC) to participate in the National Experience Survey as it may negatively impact on the User Satisfaction Survey currently in place. There is also a My Met Service pilot, which will provide victims the opportunity to report directly on the service provided by officers.

Decisions:

- Chiefs noted the update regarding the progression of the Victims and Prisoners' Bill and support both the development of the National Victim Experience Survey and the testing of metrics to demonstrate compliance with the Victims' Code.
- Chiefs noted the developments to date regarding Witness Care Units and consider their own force capacity and capability, continuing to support their witness care officers.
- Chiefs supported the next steps of the Witness Care Unit work nationally, as described above.

Collaboration between Opal and Pegasus

Action: Author to liaise with the regions to address and deliver on the following commentary/observations from forces:

- **Eastern** – The collaboration assumes that the NPCC will continue funding for Op Opal. This cannot be certain before the NPCC budgets, which we know will be tight, are considered for next FY. Whilst the work appears valuable, at this stage, the consensus of the region is to only commit until the end of the year pending NPCC budget decisions.
- **North East** - Chief Constables wanted reassurance around the future funding of this initiative and that it would not fall to forces. Reassurance is also needed that prioritisation of operational activity will remain with forces.

Decision: Chiefs agreed until the end of March 2024 only.

Intelligence Portfolio Briefing Paper

Action: Author to liaise with the regions to address and deliver on the following commentary/observations from forces:

- **Eastern** – More technical training resources information required.
- **North East** - The paper does not ask for any decisions, but there are significant implications for policing, particularly around the logistics and costs around accreditation and a review of the National Intelligence Model is a significant piece of work. More discussion is therefore needed around the issues in this paper, rather than it being just to note the updates.
- **London** - The Region agrees that to professionalise is a step in the right direction, however it was felt that more granular work needs to be done on what is in scope/out of scope and the timelines for delivery.

- **Decisions:** Chiefs noted the updates and further information and actions will be provided both within council and through the Intelligence Network. **See session 5 in the agenda.**

AI Concordat

Action: Lead to respond to all regional feedback provided.

Decision: See session 8 in the agenda.

Science and Innovation Coordination Committee

Action: Lead to respond to all regional feedback provided.

Decision: See session 8 in the agenda.

POPS Gold Command CPD

Action: Lead to review points in national working group for reporting back to the September CCC meeting.

Decision: Chiefs noted for awareness of the above changes to Public Order Public Safety improvement of gold strategies and continuous professional development.

Chief Officer Appointments Guidance

Action: Author to liaise with the regions to address and deliver on the following commentary/observations from forces:

- **East Midlands** – Region feels this should be briefing on role requirements, rather than training. How is the training practical for independent members? Fairness statement – the statement from the independent member should not be bureaucratic and should be no more than a couple of paragraphs.
- **North East and South East** - Consensus that the requirement for Independent Panel members to produce a report for the PCC should be removed. This is currently not in legislation, but some Chiefs outlined that this was already happening as it was included in College of Policing processes. There was concern that if left in the new Guidance it would be included in regulatory change which Chief Constables did not support as the role of the Independent Member is to offer an ‘independent’ perspective not be a ‘referee’ in the process. Writing of a report should be optional and not mandatory.
- **Eastern** - The guidance appears geared towards appointment to Police Officer positions. Police Staff Chief Officer roles are not mentioned. They need to be as this should be a conclusive document.

Decision: See session 7 in the agenda.

Response Attendance Times

Action: Author to liaise with the regions to address and deliver on the following:

- **East Midlands** – The region believes both urban and rural Grade 1 incidents should have a consistent 20 mins response time across the board. The response times don’t take into account forces’ geography and so there should also be the caveat that we aim to get to all calls as quickly and safely as possible.
- **North East** - There was consensus that standardisation and improving the response to the public

was important, but that agreeing some of these recommendations when they may not be deliverable could be at a huge cost with actual little benefit for the public. Issues raised in particular were around the start point for measurement (when a call is answered), which may lead to unintended consequences of longer answer times and the cost of ICT to meet the proposed requirements. Concerns around 'league tables' were also raised.

- **Eastern** - Significant concerns have been raised regarding the use of the Govt distinct urban and rural classification. The changes will also cause force analysts substantial additional work. PCCs have a legitimate voice in these decisions and their engagement to date is unclear.
- **South East and South West** - In reality, force systems are different all over the country and grading should be down to individual forces considering local priorities. Through the different forces nationally there could be a wide definition of 'rural'. This also has an unrealistic implementation timeline.

Decision: See session 10 in the agenda.

Session 2 – Agenda for Reform, including Future Criminal Justice Strategy

The Chair welcomed colleagues and outlined the key points for the session. It was outlined a team was continuing discussions with agencies to understand what would want to be seen from an Agenda for Reform. The outlined would welcome broader thoughts on the Criminal Justice Service and what Chiefs would like to see as part of this work.

5 category areas, which the team is exploring so far. These are:

1. UK Policing, being a use case for, and exploiting the very best UK Science and Technology has to offer, to stay ahead of criminality.
2. A workforce fit for the future, with specialists and leadership skills for success.
3. Criminal Justice Reform, with Criminal Justice for the digital age.
4. Much stronger national and regional infrastructure.
5. Resilient funding

Further updates were provided against specific areas:

1. Science and Technology Strategy for Policing in place and a Science and Innovation Committee will soon be stood up with a potential investment for Artificial Intelligence.
2. Need to get beyond the idea success can be measured in uniformed police officer numbers alone. Need to understand the long-term plan for our workforce.
3. Work with government and opposition to understand their requirements and visions for the future and help to inform these.
4. This is linked to point five and needs to coordinate activity at a national and regional level to minimise duplication.

The Chair opened up the room for thoughts and questions, with the following points raised:

- There is a wealth of research to suggest our current Justice System is not best placed for behavior-based crime. It is very good for incident-based crime, but we need a system which can also address behavior-based crime.
- The Criminal Justice System is seen as the police, but it is important to note the independence of the two organisations, with a joined objective.
- The Criminal Justice System should also be able to understand the reason behind offending and be able to make appropriate interventions to reduce crime.
- Local accountability is key across all relevant organisations.
- Needs to be a better understanding of what success looks like in this space.
- Much of the technical infrastructure in policing is end of life and important we begin to move to cloud based systems to ensure we can make use of modern technology.
- One Chief outlined they would like to see a national system which can flex and surge with demand.

- A number of Chiefs agreed the Criminal Justice System needs to be preventative and it is important to be able to articulate what that means and how it can be achieved.
- Highlighted the good work that has been ongoing over the previous months with Crown Prosecution Service and policing working closer together.
- Flexibility on the workforce model and simplifying specific rules is needed moving forward.
- Concerns raised around the pipeline and backlog within the Criminal Justice System.

Action: Criminal Justice lead to write to Chiefs highlighting the current Criminal Justice and Crown Prosecution Service position.

Action: NPCC Criminal Justice team to link in with team drafting Agenda for Reform.

The Chair closed the session and asked Chiefs to send any further thoughts directly to his office.

Session 3 – Head of HMICFRS Update

His Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary and of Fire & Rescue Service (HMICFRS) discussed the Force Management Statements (FMS) and initial observations based on 20 FMS files received. HMICFRS provided feedback about how FMS are being completed and what can be done to drive further improvements. The HM Inspector also discussed impartiality and police inspections.

An FMS is a self-assessment that chief constables (and London equivalents) prepare for HMICFRS each year. It looks at how forces are going to change in the future to meet some of the challenges of future demand and encourages future planning. HMICFRS use FMS extensively to help plan their inspections and as evidence.

HMICFRS Peel Portfolio Director promoted the benefits of secondments to HMICFRS. The Director highlighted the key themes that forces identified as a risk of failing to manage demand in the future. These included issues linked to ICT and high risk concerns around future demand of advancing technology, other digital needs and issues with recruiting and retaining staff with the right skill sets. Forces identified a real high risk concern about how to manage the demand that's coming out of criminal justice issues in the future.

The Deputy Portfolio Director discussed the positive feedback about what forces are delivering well. FMS have significantly improved over the last 5 years. There is also a really good understanding of what changes are taking place in forces.

Areas for improvement include understanding partnership demand. There is also a lack of forecasting and understanding of future demand, especially in preventative areas, such as neighbourhood policing or roads policing. HMICFRS are looking for more information in future FMS with regards to what is available including kit, technology, equipment.

Deputy Director stressed the need for tailored financial explanations showing forces' financial situation and how is that affecting the operational decision making. Is there change that the force cannot afford to make and if so, what are the consequences of that?

HMICFRS will provide examples from better FMS and review the template and guidance. They committed to reviewing the template with practitioners to make any changes and improvements. Guidance provided was that the FMS needs to be clear, easy to read with a consistent structure. This will really help forces understand the challenges, changes needed in the control room and in fleet. Chief Constables found the update useful and asked about automating the process with the use of AI

and Power BI. HMICFRS acknowledged FMS are snapshot in time and decisions can change, but they are interested in the big decisions/changes.

Chief Constables asked about how the information collected from FMS could be used as a national FMS which shows where policing is across the whole country that could then be used as a powerful tool to engage effectively with the Home Office and other partners as to recurring themes.

HMICFRS mentioned that a lot of the FMS is reflected in the state of policing report and acknowledged that it could become a source of national policing document, as long as the quality was right across the 43 forces which it is starting to get there. The HM Inspector committed to discussing it further with the Peel Portfolio Director and Deputy Director to find out if it is possible and how it can be done as it is a massive piece of work which requires working closely with forces and NPCC as HMICFRS collect the information for inspections.

NPCC is also investigating how we extract the analysis of all the FMS, the meaning from an NPCC perspective to help inform working committees, but also to help inform some of the strategic planning activity. NPCC will engage with HMICFRS once a plan has come to fruition. HMICFRS was very supportive of this plan and offered analytical tools and the ability to look at particular themes in policing across all 43 forces.

Chiefs are keen to work together with HMICFRS to make sure that forces get the maximum value in order to deliver the best services to communities and stressed the importance of efficiency. The HM Inspector gave an update on police impartiality which the Home Secretary commissioned the HMICFRS to undertake an inspection on. The HM Inspector will be the Senior Responsibility Officer (SRO) for the inspection and it will be overseen by HMICFRS' joint and national policing inspection director.

The HM Inspector thanked Chiefs Constables for their rapid response to the large document request.

The Home Secretary asked HMICFRS to provide initial updates on the findings in December. HMICFRS will work with the Home Office officials to set the terms of reference of what they're going to examine. This is whether police involvement and support for causes or ideologies that are either contested or have become politicised may be damaging trust and confidence which will be published on the website. That methodology will include a document review, a review of previous HMICFRS reports, case file reviews, interviews of national figures, external consultation and a comprehensive online survey. HMICFRS are also scoping and conducting some analysis of open source on police force and individual social media accounts.

HMICFRS are completely independent and all reports will reflect the evidence that they find. It will not be a political report but an evidence based report and it will have some opinion which all inspections have. The report will identify where HMICFRS think policing is doing well and where they think policing needs to greater ensure its impartiality, if that is the case. The opinions will be given before the final report to ensure that there are a number of critical readers from NPCC who have sight of it and an opportunity to address the points that are raised.

Chief Constables were generally supportive of the update but were concerned about the framing of the issue and the sensitivities within certain communities and staff members. The HM Inspector understood the points and reassured that inspections will be conducted sensitively and reiterated that it's not aimed at any particular group. HMICFRS will examine the whole terms of reference.

Chief Constables were also concerned about the social media analysis, as social media particularly X (formerly Twitter) can give a very distorted picture. Sometimes it works in favor of forces, some accounts target force accounts and amplify issues. The HM Inspector understood the concerns about

social media channeling people's individual thoughts, the different perspectives and trustworthiness of social media. The HM Inspector mentioned that it'll be a part of what HMICFRS look at, and whether any of the issues that have been stated on official police accounts stand up to scrutiny.

It was reinforced that there is an operational implication when incidents occur. From this, sometimes there is political commentary from politicians which can lead to additional demands on policing that need to be properly triaged; the threat, risk and harm. Although there are only a few incidents, they can have a disproportionate operational impact which is also experienced by the corporate communication team. The question was posed about how we get an assessment of that.

HMICFRS will ensure they have lots of focus groups and consult widely. They will interview key people from across the country, including communication teams and other parts of business. Chief Constables were concerned about the impact of achieving good diversity and inclusion in communities. There was hope the mass inspection would draw out that balance and add to the trust and confidence which is a challenge in policing. The HM Inspector acknowledged that it will be about balancing the needs of all communities. But at the core root of the report will be the question of has police impartiality been breached by the actions that it has taken on any individuals.

Chief constables welcomed a conversation ahead of an independent review and inspection and welcomed it as issues are being caused individually for forces in terms of damaging public trust and confidence. Forces can then deal with the outcome, next steps and how to take policing forward. Chief constables reflected that this was the right time to address issues and take it forwards and that the independent inspection can fully explain the situation that surrounds the issues.

Finally, the HM Inspector raised the issue of a number of forces who either aren't advertising vacancies or people are unable to be seconded due to HR processes or line managers. The Inspector stressed the benefit of having good people at the HMICFRS and the importance of supporting and encouraging those to undertake secondments. The HM Inspector also briefly discussed HMICFRS being aligned to various co-ordination committees to fully understand what is taking place to better reflect that in inspections. HM Inspector lead asked for HM Inspectors to be included in the committee meetings and discussions and mentioned a list of all the inspectors who are designated to the committees. This will produce better inspections and more importantly, it will produce a better understanding of what NPCC and policing is trying to achieve and it will make the system work more cohesively.

Decisions:

- For FMS, it is worth having a consistent approach to analysis for ease of recordkeeping. It is beneficial for all parties to understand the demand, force assets and the changes needed while improving the strategic planning process.
- Overall, feedback was mixed across forces. Some forces use the FMS which always informs their change making process, and know what is the highest risk and where to invest money or where to make cuts. There are other forces still not getting the benefits from an investment perspective.
- The HM Inspector confirmed that there will be no communications or media about the report. It's the Home Secretary's commission, but the report will be determined by the evidence and HMICFRS will report on the inspection.
- Terms of Reference for the Activism inspection with the online survey and assessment will be published for responses.
- Chiefs were encouraged to help advertise and support HMICFRS secondments programme.

- Chiefs supported the continued engagement work with HMICFRS joining on the NPCC Coordination Committees.

Session 4 – HMICFRS State of Policing Annual Assessment

Chief Constable Chair hosted a private session to reflect on the state of policing report, the survey responses, the recommendations as well as the discussion with colleagues regarding inspections and any feedback for HMICFRS.

In terms of the police impartiality inspection, Chief constables mentioned it would be good to think about the position once the findings of the inspection emerge and Chiefs were keen to have one national lead rather than 43 separate voices.

Chief constables also wanted to understand how those forces were selected for the inspection and why were they selected to understand the criteria better. In answer, there is a matrix that HMICFRS use, looking at whether Police and Crime Commissioners' (PCC) are red or blue, so that it's proportionate and balanced and HMICFRS also look at when forces were last inspected and other inspection activity that is taking place. Chiefs still thought it would be useful to have some transparency around that matrix.

Chiefs questioned whether HMICFRS will also consider the PCC's social media presence which sometimes has an equally damaging effect on public confidence. Chiefs pointed out that the inspection will be evidence led and where the opinion doesn't follow the evidence then it should be flagged.

Forces found in X (Twitter) posts, a very small proportion were actually UK based. A large proportion were American. There were estimates that around about 40% of it was bot generated. If HMICFRS are going to take a snapshot from social media, Chiefs were concerned about the demographic and how much is actually people and how much is automated/bot generated.

Chiefs are grateful good practice is included for all thematic inspections, but there was concern if there is information which can identify a particular force, then the chief constable of that force would be called out for that particular bad practice when it may not be the case. Chiefs were keen to ask HMICFRS that information is anonymised as much as it possibly can to ensure that no individual chief or force is singled out and a target of the political fallout from the impartiality inspection.

Chiefs were concerned about time scales and how quickly the inspection will take place, because it does not seem like there will be sufficient time to engage with communities especially if trying to understand the impact on community confidence. PCC's also have a different perception of community and which community matters. It was reiterated that this is such a significant question and the public are interested in the answer, including trust and confidence so the time scale is too short and exceptionally challenging. There were thoughts about whether the time scale can be influenced and extended and fed back to the Inspectorate.

There was a bit of concern over the open source search. Going beyond one click starts to become an investigative process. What is the level of open sources that's being evaluated and what mechanisms are HMICFRS using? If it is people then that designs bias into the system, if it's processes, and using some of HMICFRS tools in order to monitor sentiment on social media, then that's probably more relaxed. Chiefs are keen for HMICFRS to look at other channels beyond X, such as Facebook and Instagram as the other channels target very different members of the community. As a policing community, there is a lot of outreach on Instagram and Facebook to try to gain confidence with women as a community group. Social media shouldn't be distorting the way that policing progresses. Chiefs asked how many investigations are HMICFRS doing through open source? And is it confined to the one click or is it going further than that?

With regards to the inspections, these are complex areas of policing that are significant and very damaging depending on the outcome of the report. Chiefs asked what will the quality of the inspection teams be? Will the inspectors understand the issues and the challenges in terms of their ability and quality in general which are really complex issues. What will the findings mean in terms of reports? Chiefs trust that they can shape some recommendations and work together well with HMICFRS to understand concerns.

Chiefs moved on to discuss the state of policing report and the recommendations. There is a significant amount of research about the benefits of stop and search as it has crime prevention and crime reduction effects. But it can have negative health and well-being effects on how it is conducted. In comparison to other policing interventions like hotspot policing, for example, it's not as effective in crime reduction and crime prevention. HMICFRS are looking at the fair and just implementation of stop and search. HMICFRS will draft how that will look and what any funding request to the Home Office for that additional stop and search research would look like.

The next recommendation focused on the inspection of services delivered by PCC's. There was a lot of feedback from association police crime commissioners pointing out that the responsibility for some of the areas that HMICFRS were interested in inspecting actually fall within the remit of the Ministry of Justice (MoJ). The action from this is that HMICFRS are going to agree between the Home Office and the MoJ where these responsibilities lie and who should be responsible for giving an assessment. There were discussions about the financial context about some other functions. It left a question as to the services provided by PCCs that support policing and what is meant by that.

Recommendation 2b is about the power of direction and the legislative difficulties associated with accountability difficulties. Rather than introducing anything new, HMICFRS will look at strengthening the lines of communication between HMICFRS and PCC's if key public safety failings aren't being addressed. HMICFRS recommendation to the Home Secretary would be to use powers of intervention. On 2C this was about giving directions to both the National Police Chiefs' Council (NPCC) as a collective and to the College of Policing. The recommendation has arisen due to a lack of support from NPCC to those forces that were engaged. This will be resolved through better relationships and communication. If necessary, the Home Secretary has got powers of direction, should they be needed, though it would be difficult to direct the NPCC because the NPCC is not a legal entity.

Chief Constable Chair asked what is needed to strengthen from a NPCC perspective. Some Chiefs didn't think any strengthening was required. However, there were some Chiefs that took the opposite view and didn't think the system supported some forces in oversight. Commitments are made, but the delivery doesn't happen.

Some Chiefs wanted comparable information around improving investigations or force contact, and found it difficult to know where to look for that information. Overall, direction is positive, but systemically and structurally, there needs to be more improvement.

The College of Policing is of the view that the current voluntary collaborative approach should continue to be pursued. It's the responsibility of chiefs to identify failings, particularly those that pose a significant risk to public safety and that shouldn't require mandating. The college is keen that an assistance wide approach informs the shape of any directions issued to individual forces including improvements and support from across national bodies.

The capacity in the system to support is limited but there is a need. There was discussion about investment in a system improvement capacity. NPCC are trying to strengthen the system, coordinate the support and identify where it's given or not and make sure that there's good feedback mechanisms in place to follow up.

Recommendation 2D was about the requirements of the departments. All the public bodies and agencies whose support is needed to improve, HMICFRS wants them to voluntarily sign a memorandum of understanding about responding to HMI recommendations.

Now, for example, there's no duty on a local mental health trust to respond to HMICFRS. With a voluntary agreement, it makes the point that their help is necessary to help the force and the service provisions to the public. There doesn't need to be any additional powers or directions. It can collectively be achieved through better communication and relationships.

The final recommendation was about the appointments process. There was a long discussion about HMI involvement in the appointments process, where that overlaps with the college, where the body of knowledge sits and the performance when back in force and how that's picked up in inspection activity. There was a collective agreement to get a broad and deep talent pool and diverse candidates. HMICFRS are going to think about how they can contribute to the system.

The Home Secretary did state the legislation won't be changed. The College of Policing will share the discussion points and report back to the Home Secretary within the next couple of weeks.

Chief Constable Chair asked for experiences to be fed back into discussions with HMICFRS about how inspections are progressing and asked about how the outcome based framework has been implemented and knowledge around that.

Chief Constables discussed a previous Peel inspection which required from the force some improvements which were implemented. However, there was a statement about better outcomes for victims, but not much detail which was raised with HMICFRS, but there has been no response yet. Chiefs do not understand what it means and what needs to be achieved and were concerned how it will impact other forces that are either currently in Peel inspections or upcoming. There is no guidance from HMICFRS which explains what the volumes should be, charge rate, and what would or wouldn't be acceptable as an outcome for victims.

Chiefs had a lot of concerns in terms of the approach being taken by HMICFRS in terms of what good looks like as they are inspecting a snapshot in time rather than where forces currently are especially with different inspections taking place a few weeks apart.

Forces work alongside Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) to make a charge. This issue needs to be resolved because of what work is taking place and when forces are charging. Otherwise, it will become a confusing landscape around how inspections have been done and against what criteria. Charges are a measure of current productivity, not retrospective achievement. Charge volume might be a better indicator of progress within each force than charge rate, which is largely meaningless. Certain details need to be checked if forces are in an outcome-based inspections framework but generally Chiefs are supportive of this framework.

Chiefs were concerned about a consistent trend and there needs to be more context built into the inspections to ensure inspectors understand how individual forces operate, the context and issues so it is not directed out of proportion.

Some inspectors have been basing their assessment on the 2122 framework. But inspectors have now moved to the outcomes-based framework which has impacted on the findings and the gradings and it creates double scrutiny.

Related to the impartiality inspection, HMICFRS are using the London data company to draw information from social media platforms to assess forces; whether it's good, bad or indifferent in terms of performance and to inform inspections. But HMICFRS has discussed social media's unreliability.

Forces have asked HMICFRS and inspectors not to arrive at force inspections with the London data company knowledge. This is to avoid supporting assertions and bias and maintain an independent investigation.

Decisions:

- The key feedback from the discussion is the need for all forces to understand the rules on the outcome-based inspection in order to know what forces are being assessed against.
- Chiefs are going to pick two or three theses across forces that are concerning in draft reports which will be raised with the College of Policing and HMICFRS including charge rates.
- Chief Constable Chair will discuss with HMICFRS in terms of HMI progress, relationships, and future plans.

Session 5 – Crime Coordination Committee

The Chair introduced the session and updated on work that the Crime Committee were leading on which included; assisting with the response to the HMICFRS Activism and Impartiality review, the ongoing review of the Crime Committee, supporting the Finance Committee review and working with Norfolk on the transition of Op Hydrant, TOEX and the VKPP.

Investigations/Reasonable Lines of Enquiry

The lead provided a brief overview of the Investigations portfolio including a summary of recent changes of personnel within the portfolio and some of the areas that leads were focussing on at present.

The lead summarised the background around actionable intelligence, reasonable lines of enquiry and recent dialogue with the policing minister. The lead updated on timescales for the HMICRS national thematic inspection on investigations and the recent call for practice from the College of Policing to forces around positive and innovative practice around inspection and investigation responses. The portfolio were working with forces on the adoption of the updated APP and investigations guidelines. Work was ongoing to encourage forces to review their approach to reasonable lines of enquiry and examples have been provided to the Home Office on what would and would not constitute reasonable lines of enquiry for onward promulgation this to the public. The NPCC lead had been clear that this doesn't mean all crime is solvable and Chiefs have the autonomy to direct resources where seen fit. The lead provided an overview of next steps including working with HMICFRS and the Home Office on how the commitment to reasonable lines of enquiry will be measured.

The NPCC Chair updated that he and the lead planned to write to the policing minister to articulate that the standard inspection framework would be the best avenue to review investigation standards. Chiefs discussed what may be included in future peel inspections and the need to ensure consistency of response and to consider areas including scale, volume and complexity.

Decision: Chiefs noted the update

Action: NPCC Crime Committee to lead on the development of a FAQ/best practice document to provide examples of what is deemed as 'reasonable lines of enquiry' in the more common crime types to assist with consistency and sharing of common practice across forces – to link in with the College of Policing and the ongoing development of their 'Practice Bank'.

Action: The Chair for the Crime Committee to link in with the lead regarding engagement with the HMICFRS on the Peel Inspection process regarding any recommendations linked to 'reasonable lines of

enquiry'

Acquisitive Crime

The lead provided an overview of retail and acquisitive crime and the following areas were covered:

- Overview of serious and organised PND crimes by force and summary of crime drivers
- Key trends seen in 2023 including agricultural & construction equipment, burglary, heritage and cultural property, infrastructure and metal crime, robbery & business crime and vehicle crime
- Summary of Opal work ongoing with international law enforcement agencies
- SOAC performance over 2023
- Retail crime with violence and increase seen in crime figures – appointment of a national lead on shop theft (T/ACC Alex Goss) to work with national business crime centre
- Overview of police operations to target offending – Op Ram (high value alcohol theft), Op Amazon (national theft of tools) and Op Plutus (cigarette and tobacco theft)
- Increase in level of violence seen in 'steaming' offences and the work ongoing with retailers to address this problem and what retailers can do to address this – including engagement with Opal and Pegasus
- Summary of activity moving forwards including reasonable lines of enquiry

Chief Constables noted the update and commented on the following:

- Need to engage with the major retailers regarding their security provision alongside police resources
- Offer from NCA to assist with ensuring offenders are on warnings index
- Need to capture reach across to criminal justice and targeting OCGs, using criminal behaviour orders and recognise the expectations this will set around targeting of shop lifters and implications for police resources

The Chair thanked the lead for the work in this area and updated on recent meetings she had held with major retail stakeholders. The lead updated on the task and finish group to develop a three-page summary on reasonable lines of enquiry.

Decision: Chiefs noted the update and the recommendations for Op Opal and Pegasus to:

- Establish and maintain a single version of threats from SOC targeting retailers.
- Establish an effective process for retailers to develop and disseminate intelligence package to police and industry partners.
- Develop prevention, intelligence and enforcement activity and action plans to target identified offenders.

Action: CLOSED

Action: NPCC Crime Committee with support from the NPCC Criminal Justice Committee to link with the CPS and Criminal Justice partners regarding how to speed up proportionate charging/summary justice processes to alleviate delays in the system including looking at violence/serious crime thresholds etc.

Action: Lead to work with the task & finish group to develop a 3 page document for submission to the policing minister to articulate reasonable lines of enquiry activity that will be undertaken by policing (noting that the retail industry will produce their own 3 page summary outlining their areas of activity)

Serious and Organised Crime

The national portfolio lead provided an update on SOC activity and the following areas were covered:

- National overview – clear, hold, build and some positive areas of work seen.
- SOC local activity including establishment of SOC community coordinators and good progress on work to ensure consistent, high standard local profiles, publication of a SOC toolkit including links to good practice guidance and support.
- Overview of Op Mille phase 1 results and some of the significant operational activity undertaken.
- CLOSED

Chiefs recognised the need to ensure there was no cross over with the HMG immigration agenda and that activity remained intelligence led and focused on organised crime.

Decision: Chiefs noted the update

National Crime Agency

CLOSED

Intelligence Portfolio

The lead introduced the item and provided an update on the new code of practice which was issued by the forensics science regulator in March 2023 and will come into practice in October 2023 and compliance must be demonstrated by October 2025. There were a number of implications for policing arising from this code of practice and the lead highlighted the following areas:

- Fire service investigation.
- Analysis of comms data – this will have an impact on the core role of analysts within law enforcement and the College of Policing are working on looking at skills, accreditation and re- accreditation, core competency and CPD in order that Policing can meet the ISO requirement by 2025 – an update will be brought back to a later CCC.

Chief Constables raised the following areas:

- Is there a single version of the truth regarding the national cost of accreditation.
- Need to capture the increased demand on forces.
- Look at potential opportunities arising from data analytical tools and the potential onus on the providers of these tools.
- What are the associated business benefits arising from this.

The lead provided an update on the intelligence APP and updated on changes that had taken place in this area and advised that it was now timely for a review of the National Intelligence Model – this would be progressed at nil cost with support from suitably skilled staff in house.

Decision: Chiefs noted the update and endorsed the proposal to review the National Intelligence Model.

Action: CC Haward to link in with the intelligence lead and Chair of Finance Coordination Committee regarding the national costs of ‘business as usual’ accreditation activity – for inclusion in future spending review processes and the productivity review.

Action: NPCC Strategic Hub team to offer support to the lead in exploring the overall national costs to policing on accreditation activity and associated intelligence collation, coordination and analysis

Forensics Update

The lead introduced the item and advised the session to provide an update on the current state of the marketplace, an update on digital capability fingerprint letter that was circulated to Chiefs and an update from Gary Pugh, Forensics Regulator.

A significant amount of work was ongoing with the Home Office and PDS on digital forensics however this was not yet ready to present on recommendations of the future digital programme. The lead provided an update on the forensics marketplace and the associated gold group which was reviewing issues around the forensic provider. Developments were moving in a positive direction and work was ongoing on the development of a strategic marketplace strategy to help assist stabilise the marketplace.

CEO for Bluelight Commercial provided an overview of the marketplace position.

CLOSED

The lead updated on the fingerprint capability letter that had been sent to all Chiefs from himself and CC Rachel Swann. The fingerprint capability work had been developed at the request of policing as part of the transforming forensics work and had been led on by Police Digital Services. The lead updated on the associated finances and the decision by the Treasury to reduce the associated funding for the programme with effect from new year. A letter had been sent to Chief Constables seeking views on how to bridge the funding gap and whether policing want the capability moving forward.

The lead welcomed Gary Pugh, Forensics Science Regulator who provided an update on the forensic science regulations – the following areas were covered:

- The statutory code of practice for forensic science was approved by Parliament and published on 1 March 2023 and comes into force on 2 October 2023.
- Overview of the investigation and enforcement provisions of the Act and the powers of the regulator.
- Update on a FSR compliance survey and an outlines of some of the key findings – including the forensic science activity compliance levels.
- Summary of key priorities for senior accountable individuals (SAIs).
- Update on forthcoming activity including future plans for compliance, monitoring the introduction of the code and improving the effectiveness of statutory regulation including the accreditation process.

Decision: Chiefs noted the update.

Action: All Chief Constables to note the Fingerprint Capability letter that has been circulated and to note the request for approval of funding proposals and for a commitment to continue with the programme.

Session 6 – Chair of the Police Federation Update

Session did not proceed and will be re-organised for a future CCC meeting.

Session 7 – College of Policing

The NPCC Chair welcomed colleagues to the meeting and handed over to the College Director of Leadership and Workforce Development.

The Director provided the following updates:

Chief Officer appointment guidance

Thanked colleagues for their feedback and contributions, with the majority of contributions added to the guidance.

Highlighted further contributions from HMICFRS and PCC's on the appointment of Chief Constables following the State of Policing report, which will lead to further drafting.

Working toward current timeframes to link in with the Executive Leadership Programme to allow any changes to be in place for the end of cohort 1.

No questions were raised.

Action: Highlight changes to guidance at the next Chiefs Council (Dec).

The Director of Op Standards, Public Safety and Risk Portfolio gave the following update:

Vetting

- New Code of Practice published July 2023.
- New code sets out 18 requirement of Chief Officers to ensure effective delivery of vetting.
- The College position on dismissal following withdrawal of vetting clearance has been strengthened following recent case law.

Decisions:

- The revised Vetting Authorised Professional Practice (APP) is currently moving through the College QA process for public consultation before the end of the year and an update will be published on ChiefsNet.
- The APP working group reviewed 90 amendment requests that will be addressed in the revised APP and will be re-published.
- The APP will strengthen the position vetting is a continual process.
- Chiefs noted the College has appointed a vetting assurance manager who will commence their role soon.

No questions raised by Chief Constables.

Code of Ethics Review

Focuses on 3 principles as opposed to the Nolan Principles as the review identified number of language barriers, which are:

- Code of Practice for ethical behaviour.

- Guidance on professional and ethical behaviour.
- Ethical Policing Principles.

Core themes of the Code of Ethics and Code of Practice include:

- Diversity and Inclusion
- Respect and Fairness
- Challenge unacceptable behaviour
- Listening and responding to communities
- The need for continuous improvement
- Reflection and learning
- Openness honesty and candour
- Welfare

The structure of the new Code of Ethics will be two separate but complementary products:

1. **Code of Ethics** - Ethical Policing Principles and Guidance on ethical and professional behaviour.
2. **Code of Practice for ethical policing**

The guidance will use inclusive and positive language to provide clear expectations to staff and will provide a framework to chiefs and forces around institutional and cultural conditions.

In relation to Implementation The College will provide everything possible to forces to assist with the launch and are working towards mid-November and are cognisant of the demands of forces.

Chief Constables raised the following points:

- Highlighted the improvement in the Code.
- Welcomed focus on internal launch.
- Highlighted importance of wording and importance to get the detail correct.
- The lead highlighted further scope for colleagues to raise any further clarification points.

An update was provided by the NPCC Ethics Lead on the NPCC Ethics Portfolio. Updates included:

Portfolio has focused on 6 key areas, which are:

- Launch of the new code
- Data and Digital Ethics
- Build a Framework
- Ethics Committees
- Best practice and knowledge
- Strengthen the Network and SPOCs

The lead then outlined the "ask" to colleagues for the coming months which included:

- Proactively lead the launch of the Code
- Utilise the Task and Finish group, SPOC network and College events
- Implement and embed the Code and Principles
- Maximise the NPCC portfolio
- Optimise Ethics committees
- Capture and share learning

No question of comments raised by Chiefs.

The Chair of the NPCC raised the 4th Entry Route and highlighted the work the College team have been doing in the background. Noted the discussions with government and requested colleges support the College to get this in place. The College Director of Leadership and Workforce Development then gave an update including:

Wrote out to all Chiefs highlighting the features of the programme.

The programme has been designed to provide:

- Flexibility around delivery to be delivered in house
- Is entirely different to other entry routes and does not require entrants to achieve a formal qualification and is work based
- Is designed against the national curriculum to maintain standards
- Designed to enable all training can be completed in two years
- Probation is set on two years and focuses on core role
- Forces have flexibility to influence how candidates are assessed
- There is no academic element or requirements on the programme
- License and Q&A process will support standards
- Decisions on entry routes to be used is down to the Chief Constable
- There should be no restrictions on how recruits progress in the future.
- A summary of core requirements has been released with some forces already advertising.
- Full curriculum and mapping tools in place
- Full programme specification in place to reassure colleagues the programme can deliver.

Further information will be provided to colleagues in the coming week.

Session 8 – Science and Innovation Coordination Committee and AI Concordat (from regional submissions)

Chief Scientific Supervisor (CSA) provided an update on discussions revolved around the AI (Artificial Intelligent) Covenant, a pivotal initiative with far-reaching consequences for policing.

Recognizing the transformative potential of AI in law enforcement. Regions expressed their broad support for AI Covenant that aims to establish essential principles governing the use of AI in policing, with a focus on ensuring legality, transparency, explain ability, responsibility, and accountability.

There was a discussion about challenges related to implementation and training needed to be addressed to fully realize the benefits of the AI Covenant. To tackle these challenges, CSA had a proposal emerged for a task and finish group with its primary mission to delve into the intricacies of implementing the AI Covenant, ensuring alignment with best practices in data ethics.

Chiefs agreed that supporting and signing up to these principles was not just a matter of policy but a moral imperative, regardless of potential implementation challenges. Chiefs looked forward to having worked with the task and finish group.

Another subject of substantial significance was the establishment of the Science Innovation Committee. This committee holds the promise of significantly impacting the way policing engages with science and innovation. It is believed that the committee will represent an opportunity to secure funding for critical advancements in law enforcement, aligning with the government's focus on innovation.

Chiefs voiced their strong support for the committee, it is recognized the urgent need for policing to actively participate in discussions about science and innovation. In particular, to ensure the seamless functioning of this committee, Chiefs agreed that its chair will be tasked with shaping its working practices

and fostering alignment with other coordination committees. Besides that, there is a need of defining clear objectives and devising a framework to measure outcomes was essential to ensure that policing optimally utilizes its resources and time in discussions related to science and innovation.

Decisions

- Creation of a Task and Finish group to address any concerns of implementation.
- Agreement of the proposed direction of a Science and Innovation Coordination Committee establishment and the role of Coordination Committee Chair to be recruited through fair competition.
- There will be ongoing discussion with the police minister about short-term AI investment.
- Chiefs expected to have more work with task and finish group.

Session 9 – DDaT Coordination Committee

The NPCC lead introduced the presentation by stressing the significant threat posed by cyber through routes such as organised crime and hostile states, which he expected only to increase in the post-Russia/Ukraine conflict. The lead highlighted the public's lack of trust in the Police to handle data as evidenced by data breaches in forces, particularly the recent incident in PSNI.

The lead laid out steps taken by the Cyber Security Centre to aid in this fight. They were:

- Implementation of the SIAP process that measures cyber security across forces and helps to identify vulnerability gaps so that work can be done to ensure security.
- Evolution of the National Management Centre (NMC).
- **CLOSED**
- Development of a new Cyber Security strategy to allow proper training and accreditation and also described how policing and PDS are going to work together.

Lastly, the lead asked for all forces to support the work of Police Digital Service (PDS), NMC and Cyber Services by signing up to the national objective and overcome any territorial issues.

PDS updated and discussed the digital boundaries covering all policing organisations/forces no longer exist due to the way we are linked to other organisations. So, whilst we need to protect our organisations and prevent exploitation of vulnerabilities, we also need to think about the global threats.

PDS then discussed with chiefs the following points on Collective Responsibility:

- The challenge is how we defend against a potential foreign cyber adversary whilst rebuilding trust and confidence from the communities we serve.
- **CLOSED**
- **CLOSED**
- **CLOSED**
- Building Organisational Cyber Resilience is included in this, as it is part of the National Government Cybersecurity Strategy,

CLOSED

- The outcome of the consultation mentioned in the slide will be presented as a final proposal in December for an NPCC Cyber Security strategy that will demonstrate how policing will respond and deliver against the national capabilities.
- This strategy will cover the following issues:
 - Developing and understanding the cultural awareness
 - Leadership priorities
 - Investing in teams to ensure they have the right skills
 - Adoption of collective processes.

The PDS lead then finished the section and offered assistance and information around information security, cyber security, the work the team is undertaking and the wider services offered. The PDS National Management Centre Director then updated on the following:

- The holistic view and understanding of threats offered by the NMC means that it can share and disseminate information and proactively defend critical networks and systems in a coordinated manner and on a national level.
- An additional but pertinent Key Event that was not on the slide was discussed and that was around Digital ID where the UK's largest Digital ID supplier was hit by ransomware. The NCS needed to understand the impact to national policing but the task was made difficult by the victim not talking to the NCS. The existing knowledge was that only two forces used this form and, therefore, the risk was deemed as low. However, intelligence was then received to suggest more forces had been impacted and a large amount of data extracted, which prompted a response from the Policing Minister and the Home Secretary. This highlighted the need to know the organisations we are doing business with and do full due diligence before sending both staff and public data on.
- **CLOSED**
- A similar level of support was then offered to any force hosting any big event in the future.
- **CLOSED**
- **CLOSED**
- **CLOSED**
- **CLOSED**
- **CLOSED**
- **CLOSED**
- **CLOSED**
- **CLOSED**

- **CLOSED**

CLOSED

The next point raised by chiefs was about responsible victims and the big firms that work with law enforcement who do not report cyber incidents early and cooperate with law enforcement. Therefore, for those firms that act early and cooperate, we need to use them as an exemplar of good behaviour and support them where we can. For those who do not, contracts and commercial processes will need to be looked at to protect ourselves in the future.

The lead Lastly, urged forces to be ruthless in disposing of technical debt and out of date operating systems as these are clear vulnerabilities and could make threat detection practically impossible.

CLOSED

With no further questions, CC Stephens brought the session to a close.

Decision: National Digital Strategy Refresh will come to the January CCC meeting.

Decision: Welcome and open invite extended to all chiefs to visit the NMC.

Decision: Q3 Cyber Threat Trends going out to all forces.

Decision: PDS team with the lead will review mandatory training with the College of Policing going forwards.

Session 10 – Response Attendance Times (From Regional Submission)

The paper has gone out and Chiefs have been given a chance to give their feedback which has resulted in some items to go to consultation and visits with the APCC, HMICFRS and Home Office.

The portfolio has made a lot of progress in a short space of time. The ask is for forces to support recommendation 1 whilst more time is required to work on the rest of the recommendations which will be discussed at CCC in due course.

Recommendation 1- This is the consistent measure for nationally graded response times on receipt of call. It is done on receipt of call due to public expectations as this is how members of the public would describe the journey from the first point of contact. This links with contact management, end to end process, opportunities for continuous improvement and there are benefits for a swifter response in terms of public safety, CJ outcomes and public confidence.

There have been some concerns about the feedback about thrive and what will happen to it. There are 13 forces who are doing this on receipt of call with no issues. Thrive is not compromised.

Decision: Chiefs supported recommendation 1 whilst more time is required to work on the rest of the recommendations which be brought back as a proposal at a future CCC including timescales and costs.

National Standards

Topics discussed were target attendance times, the distinction between urban and rural and classification of these terms.

The APCC want locally decided targets and requested that the NPCC push back on the HMIC request.

Should there be differentiation between urban and rural? 16 forces currently having these distinctions in place.

Some of the concerns raised by forces were around league tables, rural/urban variation- how can we justify different levels of service?

There is work to be done on IT costs and looking at the science behind the targets.

There are also the timescales which are thought to not be achievable. There is the need to get recommendation 1 over the line for consistent measures, nationally graded response times from receipt of call. Following this there would be more work to be done on the timescales for the support of recommendation 1 and the other recommendations.

The NPCC Performance Management Coordination Committee (PMCC) offered to assist with the standardising of data task and to help work alongside this piece of work.

There was a discussion amongst Chief Constables about nationally agreed response times and the 15/20-minute split between urban and rural areas as well as the rationale behind those times.

Chief Officers discussed the need for consistency in terms of league tables, some forces are a real patchwork of urban and rural in terms of geography and the suggestion to go to the longer response time of 20 in these forces would be preferred. The issue of the classification used for urban and rural was questioned with some areas defined as rural which would be viewed locally as urban.

There were also concerns about the cost as the financial implications for this work haven't been costed out with a lot of work with boundaries and configuration.

Session 11 – NPCC Future Financial Planning Review

The Chair for the NPCC Finance Coordination Committee introduced the session by giving a recap that the NPCC is in a holding position where all forces contribute 0.13% of their NRE into the NPCC budget but where the all of the reserves held were reduced significantly in order to balance the budget. So now a new reserve strategy has been put in place as reducing reserves is not a long term solution. It will happen in this financial year, if necessary, but this will not be possible from financial year 2024/25. In addition, the 0.13% contribution will remain.

The lead then had a presentation put up and the next points are in addition to what was already displayed on the slides.

For the slide showing the NPCC Operating Budget 2024/25 Funding Bids, the lead explained that some of the bids show a significant increase in allocation from the previous year but this was due to them being reduced down as they had to be supported by the use of reserves. He also pointed out that the requests highlighted in yellow were new requests received and the ones highlighted in blue are requests where there is no option but to fund, although ways to reduce costs for these will be looked at.

The lead pointed out that there is no criticism of any of the work being done by the groups requesting funding but, after preliminary investigation, it was clear that the rules around how to use an operating budget need to be clarified. For example, some forces charge an administration fee for hosting these functions whereas some do not and there are also variations in the fees charged. However, although the preliminary work has been done, more information needs to be gathered to make recommendations as to the rules and, therefore, the proposals listed in slides 4 and 5 were made with Proposal 3 being the main one.

With reference to Proposal 3, the lead stated that a group of four Chief Financial Officers (CFOs) from across the country have volunteered to spend a day scrutinising the bids, particularly around items like the administration fees, so that a more complete recommendation can be made at the next CCC in December. In addition, once this process has been applied to all of the bids, a one page summary document for each bid will be prepared, which will then allow Chiefs to provide feedback as to the level of support for them. This is because the lead believes that it should not be the Finance Committee who determine whether they should be funded or not.

In summary, the lead stated that the only things he was asking for agreement in today's meeting were as follows:

- Continuation of the 0.13% budget cap
- No underspend to be used this financial year
- Assistance from those in receipt of funding on how the budget should be used
- Authorisation for the top 6 funding bids (those highlighted in blue).

Chiefs then discussed NRE with Cheshire Constabulary chief making the following three points:

1. As Cheshire has a recruitment freeze and are looking at redundancies, should there not be a recruitment freeze on the NPCC Central Function?
2. How were some of the bid figures arrived at and should they be revisited and reviewed, for example the funding for the Police Race Action Plan (PRAP) that comes to an end in 2024?
3. As a point of principle, the expectation should be that if you are an NPCC Committee Lead, the staffing costs should be absorbed within your own force and not provided by the Centre, unless there is an exceptional national demand.

The lead first responded to the third point by stating that, as part of the CFO review, they will be drafting a template grant agreement for all the funds allocated that will contain principles including a cap on admin fees and what forces should be absorbing as costs; this should then be common across all areas of spend.

With reference to the funding, and particularly the PRAP, they will be contacting each budget holder to gain clarity as to how long the funding is going to be required moving forward, as the operating budget is picking up. The lead gave the Wildlife Crime Unit as an example as something that has been running for years with permanent staff so full openness and clarity as to where the money is going will be needed.

The chief from Cheshire Constabulary replied that, with programmes that are agreed as time-specific, a clear exit strategy needed to be set to deal with staff concerns and any political elements. The lead agreed with this point and this will form part of the recommendations that he will bring to CCC in December.

Chiefs then asked, as part of the review panel's work, that they ensure they look at the value and value added to policing of the programmes, particularly when considering extending them. In addition, and

with reference to the PRAP, she believed that this needed to be debated in full at the next CCC to discuss the advantages or disadvantages of discontinuing it.

In response to the first point, the lead stated that the CFOs will be looking at the accounting of programmes, how the bids are structured and taking into account efficiencies and shared economies. Then the decision over which requests are supported will be given to Chiefs with the opportunity to given to budget holders to set out and underline the value that each of the programmes brings to policing as part of the summary document.

Chiefs supported the proposals but asked that the consequences of reducing or ending funding are taken into account in terms of the impact to the home force who may have no influence in the decision. The lead agreed with this and answered that he ensured that when the CFOs do the financial due diligence, they will have an understanding of what any redundancies and pension strain might be, although it may also be that the previously mentioned budget underspend could be ringfenced to cover this so that the costs are not borne by one individual force.

A number of chiefs then voiced their support of the lead's proposal but suggested that annual review stages and milestones needed to be built in to see how the programme is progressing against its aim and purpose. The lead replied that a discussion needed to be held to see how the Hub could assist in the both continuous and yearly monitoring and review of the programmes. The NPCC Chair added that a problem with this is getting the staff into the Hub and its long-term funding so he is in consultation with the Home Office about the sustainability in funding due to the importance of the work the NPCC do for the future of policing and the current struggle to deliver them.

A number of chiefs asked about the procedure for dealing with the bids that did not come in the top 6 on the list. Would the decision, as part of the review, be start, continue or stop and would it consider the size, scale and ambition of the project, particularly as the budgets might be limited by the cap on the NRE? The lead suggested that the review of documents would summarise what had been delivered and what was intended to be delivered but that it would be a collective decision of Chiefs to decide on the future of the programme. Some chiefs asked, for all of the programmes, that other ways of funding, staffing levels, reducing admin costs or ways of working are considered before the decision is made as to which programme to fund. The lead in reply, made the point that many of the functions also receive outside funding from other sources and this makes it more complex but said that he will ensure the information that comes out takes all this into account.

Decision: The four proposals had received support from chiefs.

Decision: An all-chiefs meeting will be held for Academic research into the disproportionate use of Taser

Session 12 – Diversity, Equality an Inclusion (DEI) and Operational Effectiveness

Decision: Chiefs noted the update.

Decision: Chiefs would review the application of suitably qualified staff for secondment opportunities to PRAP as part of the National Operating Budget once presented in the December CCC meeting – see session 11.

Decision: An all-chiefs meeting will be held for Academic research into the disproportionate use of Taser

Session 13 – Workforce Coordination Committee

Strategic Workforce Lead (SWL) started with an update about the progress made in collecting data on reasons for officer resignations, that most of forces are now able to provide such data. This improvement in data collection signifies a significant step forward.

There was a strong support for a data framework aimed at understanding the reasons behind attrition more deeply. It promises to offer granular insights into the factors influencing officers' decisions to leave the force.

There was concern about the retention of detectives within the police force. To tackle this, an in-depth investigation has been initiated to understand why entry-level detectives are leaving the force at a higher rate than in previous years. An action plan is now in place to examine the inconsistent use of incentives like variable pay, especially in relation to taking exams. A proactive initiative is currently in progress to comprehensively understand the reasons behind early pension opt-outs and provide officers with better support and options.

Next, Chiefs were provided with updates on the Home Office dismissals review and related matters.

During a comprehensive review of 76 pieces of literature, there was a focus on enhancing public confidence and improving the efficiency of the system while granting Chiefs greater influence over employee matters. It was recommended for an introducing of a rebuttable presumption and dismissal for gross misconduct, creating a new list of bar defences for certain offenses, and implementing a presumption of fast-track hearings for former officers.

Empowering senior officers, particularly A/C CS, to oversee fast tract proceedings was endorsed. Panel composition was maintained with three members, chaired by senior officers, and including legally qualified members and independent appointees.

Chiefs were then granted the right to appeal, emphasizing accountability. The decisions made reflected a commitment to balance, higher standards, and efficiency in the system.

There was also a discussion about statutory requirements for holding and maintaining vetting levels. This change allows for the potential dismissal of individuals who fail to maintain the required vetting level. Additionally, efforts were being made to streamline processes, particularly regarding Regulation 13 guidance on the discharge of probationary constables. It is believed that refining these processes could make it easier to terminate the services of certain individuals.

Next, there was a discussion of resource allocation. It was an urgency of accelerating work aligned with upcoming activities. There was a proposal to allocate approximately 67K from underspend funds to sustain a crucial position until the end of the financial year.

Chiefs agreed that this allocation would not only ensure the success of vital projects but also optimize resource utilization.

Meanwhile, a question was raised about the level at which certain decisions could be delegated down. In particular, the authority for certain decisions, such as charring hearings, was discussed. It was suggested that Assistant Chief Constables (A/C CS) could be delegated this authority, and there will be work on a training course to ensure that individuals are equipped to handle these responsibilities effectively.

Addressing the challenges of this, Chiefs expressed a willingness to contribute to the improvement of the process and development of solutions by doing collaboration and having support from individuals who had experience in charring Regulation 13 hearings and were familiar with the processes related to misconduct and dismissal decisions.

Decision

- The need of a training course organised to support on delegating authority.
- Chiefs wanted more of collaboration and support from experience individuals in chairing Regulation 13 hearings.

Moving on, the meeting focused on the implementation of the pension remedy within the police scheme. Key topics discussed included the status of implementation, member experiences, actions for Chiefs, delegating decision-making, timelines, and available resources.

First, Head of Police Pensions provided an overview of the status of implementing the pension remedy and the challenges faced due to the complexity and changes in legislation.

Chief mentioned concerns raised by the Superintendents Association regarding member experiences. It was proposed that individuals currently undergoing the pension process share their firsthand experiences. This initiative aims to pinpoint specific areas for improvement and enhance overall member satisfaction.

Besides that, there was an outline of actionable steps for Chiefs to navigate the complex landscape effectively. These steps include assessing readiness for changes, active engagement with the Scheme Managers Steering Group, and liaising with regional representatives to ensure a coordinated effort. Therefore, it was necessary having streamlining decision-making processes by establishing a single scheme manager structure, enhancing governance, and ensuring proper resourcing. This approach aims to manage the pension scheme more efficiently and consistently.

Chiefs also highlighted the availability of valuable resources and information on the police pensioninfo.co.uk website. Notably, a pension calculator is accessible to help members understand and compare their pension schemes, providing clarity and support.

Finally, there was a discussion regarding the timeline for implementing the remedy, with a focus on those retiring after October 1st and the 18-month period for providing remediable service statements for those who have already retired.

Decision:

- An advice to check with regional representatives, assess readiness, and stay engaged with the Scheme Managers Steering Group.
- Ongoing coordination efforts for a single scheme manager function, which will be discussed further with Chief Financial Officers (CFOs) and reported to CCC in the future
- Funding discussions for the proposed single scheme manager function will continue.
- Ongoing work to coordinate efforts for a single scheme manager function was discussed, with the aim of reporting to Chiefs Council by December.

Session 14 – Violence against Women and Girls (VAWG) with Operation Soteria

Decisions: Chiefs agreed the following:

- All forces agreed and adopted the RASSO National Operating Model.
- All chiefs supported working with the College of Policing to achieve 2000 specialist rape investigators by April 2024, that all will adopt the new SSAIDP process and there is support to ensure all Heads of Public Protection complete the course being developed.
- All chiefs supported the implementation of the one-day rape responders training.

Action: Chiefs supported having a wider VAWG discussion at the December CCC meeting with recommendations and delivery of framework for the next three years.

Session 15 – Review of Productivity in Policing (Open Session)

The NPCC Chair welcomed colleagues to the meeting and handed it over to the Productivity Review Lead.

The lead outlined the report that is being finalised and wanted to highlight recommendations. Outlined it is not possible to share the report until mid to late October as it will be shared with the Home Secretary.

The lead thanks colleagues for the collaborate approach taken to this work. Highlighted the recommendations which fall under the following headlines:

- **Data:** Cross cutting data across numerous business areas. The aspiration is to create a data hub which will sit within the College of Policing which will pull together data. Workforce Committee and Mental Health Portfolio are supportive.
- **Evaluation:** Found lots of good projects and change in forces however, the evaluation of these projects is not always carried out effectively. The view is to standardise this across forces.
- **Recommendations:** Consider impact on forces. Cost vs effectiveness and consider ability of implementation on force. This will help to narrow and focus recommendations.
- **Mental Health Barrier:** Recommendations will be clear to evaluate, monitor, update and brief the Home Sec and Minister twice in the next 12 months to understand progress against roll out of RCRP implementation across forces.
- **Home Office Counting Rules:** As above regular reporting required to Home Secretary.

Phase 2 recommendations:

Potential phase 2 recommendations fall under the following areas:

- **Workforce**
 - Improve productive use of restricted officers and staff.
 - Sickness management and absence management is addressed in the best way
 - Training - costs and benefits of training
 - Strategic assessment of workforce can be more future focused.
- **Technology**
 - How to resource innovation with increased funding. Science, Innovation and Coordination Committee will be key in this space.
 - Highlight the important role of the Home Office in the development of new solutions.
 - Workforce solutions for key skilled individuals.
 - Force Management statements, how forces value tech to run an efficient and effective police force.
- **Model Process**
 - Further roll out of the Model Process over the next 18 months.
 - Additional process added around case file quality and process.
 - Concern around burden of completion of productivity survey - and will ask to simplify process.

- **Best practice**
- Investment case developed on endowment funds.
- Strengthening of future spending review bids.
- National Community Safety Board would be important to implement.

Policing Productivity Team will be recommended to continue to monitor recommendations and work across four further areas for exploration:

- A) Missing people
- B) Custody
- C) Artificial Intelligence
- D) Restricted Duties.

Chief Constables raised the following questions:

- Important to expose barriers to policing.
- An optimal workforce mix would look like, and it is important to understand and appreciate the optimum Officer and Staff ratio.

Session 16 – Review of Productivity in Policing (Closed Session)

Chief Constables discussed the points raised in the previous session and talked through communications around the plan and key points they wished to highlight. As follows:

Communication
around releaseKey
Points wish to
highlight Any requests
wish to make

Work with partners, keep head above water, investment is still required around this.
Tech investment requires capital grant which no force has. Affordability angle and share West Yorkshire Police concerns.

Not all recommendations are within our gift and working against employment legislation.

Any other Business

No other business was recorded.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next full CCC meeting will be held on **6-7 December 2023**.